



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,504	05/04/2001	William Donovan Quigg	33582-8001US1	8692
25096	7590	05/22/2008		
PERKINS COIE LLP			EXAMINER	
PATENT-SEA			LASTRA, DANIEL	
P.O. BOX 1247				
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3688	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/849,504

Applicant(s)

QUIGG, WILLIAM DONOVAN

Examiner

DANIEL LASTRA

Art Unit

3688

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 and 49-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 and 49-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C2)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-47 and 49-67 have been examined. Application 09/849,504 has a filing date 05/04/2001 Claims Priority from Provisional Application 60/202,583 (05/09/2000).

Response to Amendment

2. In response to Non Final Rejection filed 09/05/2007, the Applicant filed a Request for reconsideration on 02/28/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 18 and 22 are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Said claims recite a "tracker" which is defined in Applicant's specification page 8, line 3 as just software. Therefore, said claims are not system claims. Claim 26 is directed to non-statutory subject matter as said claims recite "a computer readable medium" without any executable software code.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See

MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: there is not structure in the claims as said claims are just software and not system claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 11, 14, 16-18, 20-23, 26, 27, 29-32, 34-40, 43-45, 49, 51-54, 57-59, 61-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan (US 6,173,274) in view of Giacomozzi (WO 96/29263).

As per claims 1, 11, 29, 43-45, 57, 61, 64 and 67, Ryan teaches:

A computer system for processing a paper product, comprising:

a product order tracker configured to receive a paper product order from a paper purchaser (see Ryan column 9, lines 1-5) to purchase a paper product (see Ryan figure 1, item 17) that is produced by a manufacturer (see column 8, lines 35-40; "postage meter manufacturer"; col 4, lines 5-30; col 13, lines 1-10;). Ryan teaches a method of manufacturing a production mail system where users purchase paper products where said paper products are the mailpieces (see figure1, items 17, 19, 20).

the paper product including a roll of paper or a plurality of unbound, stacked paper sheets (see Ryan figure 1, item 17; col 6, lines 37-42). Ryan teaches that "the supervisory controller 302 instructs the accumulator module 320 how many successive

pages 17a are contained within each document 17. In conventional fashion, the accumulator module 320 assembles together successive pages 17a all pertaining to a particular document 17, respectively" (see col 6, lines 37-42). Therefore, Ryan teaches that document 17 in figure 1 is a unbound, stacked paper sheet similar to Applicant's specification figure 1, item 160.

a promotions order tracker configured to receive a promotional material order from a third-party advertiser to place promotional material on an enclosure for the paper product (see column 9, line 42 – column 10, line 60)

wherein the promotional material is specifically targeted to a group of people associated with the paper purchaser, the group comprising those people likely to purchase the goods or services of the third party advertiser (see col 10, lines 15-50);

and a paper product tracker configured to provide instructions for creating the enclosure for the paper product (see column 6, lines 50-52), the enclosure having the promotional material of the received promotional material order, the paper product tracker further being configured to provide instructions to enclose the paper product of the received order with the created enclosure, wherein the manufacturer, the paper purchaser, and the third-party advertiser are different entities (see column 8, lines 1-40); and the third-party advertiser pays to have the promotional material placed on the enclosure of the paper product (see column 10, lines 14-20; column 13, lines 5-10).

Ryan does not expressly teach that the manufacturer is a paper manufacturer. However, Giacomozzi teaches that it is old and well known in the promotion art to print promotional messages or advertisements on the enclosures or wrappers of manufacture

products, such as paper handkerchiefs and where said messages or advertisements are not linked to the contained paper products in said wrappers (see figure 1; abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that advertisers would use the Ryan's system to print promotional materials into the wrappers of paper products, as taught by Giacomozzi in view that third party advertisers would pay the paper manufacturers (i.e. handkerchief manufacturers) for including advertisements into said wrappers, as taught by Ryan and in view that said paper manufacturers would be motivated to use said payment to lower the selling price of said manufacturers' paper products in order to better compete with other sellers of said paper products. Third party advertisers would pay Giacomozzi's paper manufacturers to include advertisements into the Giacomozzi's paper enclosures using the targeting system taught by Ryan in view that said advertisers would be able to better target their advertisements based upon customers profiles, therefore, increasing the probability that said advertisements would reach their intended target. Commercial users (see Ryan column 9, lines 1-3) would include advertisements into purchase paper products in view that said advertisements would permit said users to purchase said products at a lower price in comparison of purchasing said products without advertisements. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the business art that retailers and/or manufacturers lower the price of their inventory for the purpose of making their inventory more attractive to buyers and therefore, increasing the probability of selling said inventory. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that manufacturers and/or retailers of

Art Unit: 3688

paper products would include advertisements into wrappers of said paper products in view that the money pay by advertisers for said including would allow said manufacturers and/or retailers to lower the selling price of said products, making their products more attractive to buyers and therefore, increasing the probability of selling said products.

As per claims 2, 14, 16, 18, 20-23, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34-39, 49, 52-54, 58-59 and 62-63, Ryan teaches:

a remuneration tracker configured to track remuneration paid by the third-party advertiser for the promotional material and tracking receipt of remuneration from the paper purchaser for the paper product (see Ryan column 10, lines 7-17).

As per claim 3, Ryan teaches:

an artwork tracker configured to provide instructions for creating a fixed medium that includes the promotional material (see Ryan column 6, lines 50-55).

As per claims 4, 30 and 51, Ryan teaches:

wherein the promotions order tracker is configured to coordinate enclosing the paper product with a particular enclosure based on the content of the promotional material, the identity of the paper purchaser, and/or a location to which the paper product is to be delivered (see column 9, lines 42-55 “address restriction data”; col 13, lines 30-40).

As per claim 5, Ryan teaches:

wherein the promotional material order is a first promotional material order for first promotional material and the third-party advertiser is a first third-party advertiser,

and wherein the promotions order tracker is configured to receive a second promotional material order from a second third-party advertiser to place second promotional material on the enclosure (see column 10, lines 54-57).

As per claim 6, Ryan teaches:

wherein the product order tracker is configured to receive a paper product order (see column 1, lines 47-50; col 11, lines 25-60; col 12, line 60 – col 13, line 10) for unbound, stacked sheets of paper and/or a roll of paper.

As per claim 7, Ryan teaches:

wherein the promotions order tracker is configured to receive an order for an advertisement placed on a wrapper (see column 9, lines 42-67) to enclose unbound stacked sheets of paper (see col 6, lines 37-42). Ryan teaches that “the supervisory controller 302 instructs the accumulator module 320 how many successive pages 17a are contained within each document 17. In conventional fashion, the accumulator module 320 assembles together successive pages 17a all pertaining to a particular document 17, respectively” (see col 6, lines 37-42). Therefore, Ryan teaches that document 17 in figure 1 is a unbound, stacked paper sheet similar to Applicant’s specification figure 1, item 160.

As per claim 17, Ryan teaches:

tracking receipt of remuneration from the paper purchaser to an intermediate party for the paper product (see column 13, lines 1-10).

As per claim 40, Ryan teaches:

wherein providing instructions for disposing promotional material includes providing instructions for printing an advertisement on an external surface of the enclosure (see column 9, lines 42-67).

As per claim 65, Ryan teaches:

instructing another entity to dispose the promotional material on the enclosure (see column 10, lines 54-60).

Claim 66, Ryan teaches:

wherein the product order tracker is configured to receive a paper product order for unbound, stacked, unfolded sheets of papers (see col 11, lines 25-60; col 12, line 60 – col 13, line 10; figure 1, item 17). Ryan teaches that “the supervisory controller 302 instructs the accumulator module 320 how many successive pages 17a are contained within each document 17. In conventional fashion, the accumulator module 320 assembles together successive pages 17a all pertaining to a particular document 17, respectively” (see col 6, lines 37-42). Therefore, Ryan teaches that document 17 in figure 1 is a unbound, stacked paper sheet similar to Applicant's specification figure 1, item 160.

As per claim 67, Ryan does not expressly teach wherein the paper purchaser manufacturer is an office and the group of people are employees that work in the office. However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the business art that offices' employees orders paper products. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that offices employees would include advertisements into wrappers of order paper products,

as taught by Ryan in view that said advertisers would subsidy the cost of said paper products.

6. Claims 8, 9, 24, 28, 42 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan (US 6,173,274) in view of Giacomozzi (WO 96/29263) and further in view of Itkonen (US 5,473,863).

As per claims 8, 24, 28, 42 and 56, Ryan fails to teach:

wherein the promotions order tracker is configured to receive an order for an advertisement placed on a wrapper configured to enclose a roll of paper. However, Itkonen teaches a method for wrapping a roll of paper, where said wrapper is often printed with advertisement (see column 1, lines 64-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that the same method use by Ryan to print advertisements in the enclosure of unbound, stacked paper sheets (see Ryan figure 1, item 17) would be used to print advertisements in the Itkonen's roll wrapper of a roll of paper sheets in view that said wrapper would include promotions that would subsidize the cost of producing and wrapping said paper roll, as taught by Ryan.

As per claim 9, Ryan teaches:

wherein the promotions order tracker is configured to receive an order for an advertisement placed on paper enclosure (see column 9, line 42 – column 10, line 25) but does not expressly teach that said enclosure is a box configured to enclose the paper product. However, Giacomozzi teaches that it is old and well known in the promotion art to print promotional messages or advertisements on the enclosures or

wrappers of manufacture products, such as paper handkerchiefs and where said messages or advertisements are not linked to the contained paper products in said wrappers (see figure 1; abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that advertisers would use the Ryan's system to print promotional materials into the wrappers of paper products (i.e. paper handkerchiefs), as taught by Giacomozzi in view that third party advertisers would pay the paper manufacturers (i.e. handkerchief manufacturers) for including advertisements into said wrappers, as taught by Ryan.

7. Claims 10, 25, 33, 41, 55, 60 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan (US 6,173,274) in view of Giacomozzi (WO 96/29263) and further in view of Crossman (US 5,035,515).

As per claims 10, 25, 33, 41, 55, 60 and 64, Ryan fails to teach:

wherein the promotions order tracker is configured to receive an order for a coupon placed on or enclosed by the enclosure. However Crossman teaches package wrappers having detachable coupons (see figure 1). Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Ryan would include third party advertisers coupons into a package wrappers, as taught by Crossman in order to offset the cost of producing said products by billing advertisers for said including, as taught by Ryan.

8. Claims 12, 13, 15, 19, 46, 47 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan (US 6,173,274) in view of Giacomozzi (WO 96/29263) and further in view of Loeb (US 6,421,652).

As per claims 12, 13, 15, 19, 46, 47 and 50, Ryan fails to teach:

wherein receiving a paper product order includes receiving the order from an intermediate party, with the intermediate party receiving the order from the paper purchaser or a third-party advertiser and tracking receipt of remuneration from the third-party advertiser to an intermediate party for the promotional material. However, Loeb teaches that 60% of all new subscriptions are acquired by third-party service providers (see column 2, lines 10-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art the time the application was made, to know that Ryan would use intermediary parties (i.e., agents) that would work to bring more customer to order paper products. The intermediary party would be more than willing to serve as an intermediary in the interaction between paper purchasers and advertisers because said intermediary party would receive remuneration from said interaction.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 02/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that in direct contrast to both Ryan and Giacomozzi, applicant's technology is related to placing advertisements on enclosures for paper products with the advertisements specifically targeted to a group of people that are likely to be exposed to the paper product but according to the Applicant, Ryan targets advertisements to a single individual. The Examiner answers that Ryan teaches targeting ads to commercial users (see col 9, lines 50-55), targeting ads to a cluster of recipients (i.e. group), where said clustering is based upon geographic location (see col 13, lines 32-34) and furthermore, Ryan teaches that advertisers target an audience (i.e.

group of peoples) (see col 3, lines 1-2). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Ryan teaches targeting to a group of people or recipients.

The Applicant argues that it is not correct to say that a batch of Ryan's letters is the same as one of Applicant's paper products because according to the Applicant, a batch of Ryan's letter is not surrounded by an enclosure having promotional material. The Examiner answers that Applicant's claims recite "place promotional material on an enclosure for the paper product". Ryan's letters are paper products (see figure 1, item 17) and Ryan places promotional material on the enclosure of said paper products (see Ryan figure 1, item 20). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Ryan teaches Applicant's claimed limitation.

The Applicant argues Ryan teaches that a individual piece of mail is addressed to a single recipient and the advertisements placed on each piece of mail targets only that single recipient. The Applicant further argues that there is nothing in Ryan that teaches that a single letter would be viewed by a group of people or that that the sender of the letter is aware of that group so as to target advertisements to them. The Examiner answers that the Applicant is arguing about limitation not stated in the claims. Applicant's claims simply recites "placing promotional material on an enclosure for the paper product, wherein the promotional material is specifically targeted to a group of people". Ryan teaches placing promotional material on an enclosure for the paper product (see figure 1, items 17 and 20) wherein the promotional material is targeted based upon demographic and/or geographic location of a target audience (see col 10,

lines 15-50). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Ryan teaches Applicant's claimed limitation.

The Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Ryan's system and print promotional onto Giacomozzi's wrappers because Ryan teaches away from placing promotional material on Giacomozzi's wrappers because, according to the Applicant, in Giacomozzi the advertiser cannot exercise any control over who receives the message. The Applicant further argues, that in Giacomozzi, the message is received by random individuals who either purchase Giacomozzi's handkerchief packages or notice the promotional message on the package and this is, according to the Applicant, the type of advertising Ryan's invention is designed to avoid. According to the Applicant, the Examiner's suggested use of Ryan's system to print promotional material onto Giacomozzi's wrappers contravenes one purpose of Ryan's invention – overcoming the disadvantage of conventional advertising campaigns in which the third party advertiser has no assurance that a target audience would be reached. The Examiner answers that if Giacomozzi would have mentioned anything that disparage the targeting advertisement by user or advertisers' profile, then the Applicant would have had a point. However, Giacomozzi never mention anything that disparage targeting of advertisement. Furthermore, Giacomozzi was used by the Examiner to simply teach that it is old and well known in the promotion art to print promotional messages or advertisements on the enclosures of manufacture products, where said messages or advertisements are not linked to the contained paper products in said wrappers (see figure 1; abstract). Ryan discloses placing advertisements into the

enclosure of paper products (see figure 1, item 17) where said advertisements are targeted based upon users and advertisers' profiles or preferences. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that advertisers would place advertisements in the Giacomozzi's wrappers if said advertisers would have had control on the type of advertisements that said advertisers would want to advertise and the type of users that said advertisers would want to target (*i.e.* geographic location, age, income), as taught by Ryan in view that said advertisers are paying for said placing and therefore, would like to have control of said placing. Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Ryan does not teach away from placing promotional material on Giacomozzi's wrappers.

The Applicant further argues that Giacomozzi also teaches away from combining his disclosed features with those of Ryan because according to the Applicant, Giacomozzi is directed to displaying promotional messages to the public at large, not message targeted to a specific recipient and Ryan teaches promotional message to a single recipient of the message. Therefore, the Applicant argues that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Ryan with Giacomozzi. The Examiner answers that that examiner used the Giacomozzi reference only to teach that it is old and well known in the promotion art to print promotional messages or advertisements on the enclosures or wrappers of manufacture products, such as paper handkerchiefs and where said messages or advertisements are not linked to the contained paper products in said wrappers (see figure 1; abstract) and Ryan teaches targeting messages to a target audience based upon said audience demographic and/or geographic location

(see col 10, lines 15-55). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Ryan and Giacomozzi are combinable.

The Applicant argues that the "enclosure" in Applicant's claim 1 differs from Ryan enclosure because according to the Applicant, the "enclosure" in Applicant's claims typically sit stacked in an oft-frequented office area for weeks or month, thus it is possible to place promotional material on such an enclosure that is targeted to known group of people and that will be exposed to the people for an extended period of time. The Examiner answers that the Applicant is arguing about limitation not stated in the claims. Nowhere, in Applicant's claims is recited anything about "oft-frequented office areas" and "exposed to people for an extended period of times".

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL LASTRA whose telephone number is 571-272-6720 and fax 571-273-6720. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ERIC W. STAMBER can be reached on 571-272-6724. The official Fax number is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3688

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/DANIEL LASTRA/

Art Unit 3688

May 17, 2008